

## REMARKS

Claims 1 through 14 continue to be in the case.

### *The Office Action refers to the Specification*

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because legal phraseology, i.e., "comprises" should be avoided in the abstract. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01 (b).

Applicants are submitting a revised abstract on a separate page with this amendment to overcome the objection.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: 1) applicant should insert a section at the beginning of the specification providing a cross-reference to the previously filed related applications to which applicant claims filing date priority;

Applicants are introducing into the application a cross-reference to the underlaying PCT-application.

2) applicant should insert typical section headings throughout the specification, so that one reading a patent issuing from the instant application would be able to quickly differentiate between the prior art and the instant invention;

Applicants are introducing section headings into the specification in the present amendment.

3) on page 5, lines 13-14, the reference to the claims should be replaced by descriptive language.

Applicants are deleting the language of the specification referring to the claims and furnish instead descriptive language.

Appropriate correction is required.

The applicants are amending the specification to furnish appropriate corrections.

***The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112.***

4. Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants are amending the claims to obviate the rejections.

In claim 1, lines 4 and 7, "production line section" should apparently be replaced by the phrase - product line section- to provide consistent language throughout the claims. Also, in claim 1, line 7, "an" should be replaced by -a- for clarity; while on line 8, --, single part- should apparently be inserted between "non-welded" and "production element", to provide consistent claim language throughout the claims.

Amendments are now introduced which are intended to provide for consistent claim language throughout the claims.

In claim 2, -non-welded,- should apparently be inserted before "single part" to provide consistency throughout the claims. Also, applicant should consider inserting the phrase -or a ceramic— between "plastic" and the period at the end of the claim.

The language "non-welded" has been introduced throughout the claims.

In claim 3, "or a ceramic" should be deleted, since claim 3 depends from claim 2 and claim 2 requires the element to be "plastic", which does not encompass the term "ceramic".

In claim 8, line 2, "therein" should be replaced by -wherein-.

In claim 9, "single part production element" should be replaced by -non-welded, single part production element- for consistency throughout the claims.

In claim 13, "single part production element", both occurrences, should be replaced by -non-welded, single part production element- for consistency throughout the claims.

Applicants are amending the claims to render them fully allowable.

***The Office Action refers to Allowable Subject Matter.***

5. Claims 1-14 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Applicants very much appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter.

They are amending the claim in view of rendering them fully allowable.

The prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest a steam injection module including a non-welded, single part production element formed from a product line section and a steam tube, which is surrounded by a two-part, steel carrier.

Applicants sincerely appreciate that the examiner has clearly expressed the reasoning behind the indication of allowable subject matter.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerhard Brockmann et al.

By: Horst M Kasper  
Horst M. Kasper, their attorney,  
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059  
Tel.:(908)526-1717 Fax:(908)526-6977  
Reg. No. 28,559; Docket No.: SSB201

/am